



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/745,897	12/21/2000	Yoshihiro Satoh	JA999745	2636

7590 06/17/2003

Blanche E. Schiller, Esq.
HESLIN & ROTHENBERG, P.C.
5 Columbia Circle
Albany, NY 12203

EXAMINER

MAHMOUDI, HASSAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2175

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/745,897

Applicant(s)

SATOH, YOSHIHIRO

Examiner

Tony Mahmoudi

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 March 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 25 March 2003 is: a) ☐ approved b) ☒ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DOV POPOVICI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2400

23

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to communications filed on 25-March-2003, claims 1 and 3-8 are amended, and new claim 9 is added per applicant's request. Therefore, claims 1-9 are pending in the application.
2. The proposed drawing correction filed on 25-March-2003 is disapproved by the examiner because the corrections to the labels are not made in red ink. Correction is required in reply to this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
4. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bapat et al (U.S. patent No. 6,236,996) in view of Celik (U.S. patent No. 6,374,259.)

Art Unit: 2175

As to claim 1, Bapat et al teaches a computer system for controlling access to data to be used in common by multiple users (see Abstract, and see column 32, lines 35-42), comprising:

data storage for storing the data in common (see column 7, lines 37-38, and see column 32, lines 37-40);

an access management table including access management data to control an access right to the data in common (see column 3, lines 31-41, where “access management table” is read on “permission table”); and

control means (see column 3, lines 15-17) for automatically updating the access management data (see column 18, lines 36-40) in the access management table (see column 4, lines 53-54, and see column 8, lines 35-40), concurrent with and in response to transmitting a communication (see column 15, line 67 through column 16, line 7, where “concurrent with” is read on “virtually simultaneously”, and “transmitting communication” is read on “receiving any event notification”, and see column 16, lines 55-61), in which reference information to the data in common are included (see column 8, lines 37-41, where “data in common” is read on “shared with other servers”), wherein the user is granted the access right to the data pursuant to the automatic updating of the access management data responsive to the transmitting of the communication (see column 13, lines 17-30.)

Bapat et al does not teach a first user who is authorized to grant an access right to the data to a second user; and wherein the second user is granted the access rights.

Celik teaches storage and retrieval of business contact information (see Abstract), in which he teaches a first user who is authorized to grant an access right to the data to a second

Art Unit: 2175

user (see Abstract, and see column 1, lines 50-58, and see column 11, lines 51-57); and wherein the second user is granted the access rights (see Abstract, and see column 2, lines 38-46.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bapat et al to include a first user who is authorized to grant an access right to the data to a second user; and wherein the second user is granted the access rights.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bapat et al by the teachings of Celik, because a first user who is authorized to grant an access right to the data to a second user; and wherein the second user is granted the access rights, would enable select users (master users) to grant access rights and be able to control (modify and/or revoke) such access rights to other users, in order to share contents within a distributed database system.

As to claim 2, Bapat et al as modified teaches wherein the access management data in the access management table (see Bapat et al, column 3, lines 31-41, where “access management table” is read on “permission table”) includes identification information for data to be accessed (see Bapat et al, column 3, lines 26-30, where “identification information for data to be accessed” is read on “management information for corresponding managed objects”), identification information for the second user to whom the access right to the data has been granted (see Celik, column 2, lines 9-17), and access level information (see Bapat et al, column 12, line 58 through column 13, line 3.)

As to claim 3, Bapat et al as modified teaches wherein the access management data in the access management table (see Bapat et al, column 3, lines 31-41, where “access management table” is read on “permission table”) includes identification information for the first user who grants the access right to the second user (see Celik, column 1, lines 50-57.)

As to claim 4, Bapat et al as modified teaches wherein the control means (see Bapat et al, column 3, lines 15-17) automatically updates the access management data (see Bapat et al, column 18, lines 36-40) in response to a command (see Bapat et al, column 18, lines 1-9) that is automatically issued during the transmitting of the communication (see Bapat et al, column 15, line 67 through column 16, line 7, where “transmitting of the communication” is read on “receiving any event notification”, and see column 16, lines 55-61.)

As to claim 5, Bapat et al as modified teaches the computer system further comprising:
a plurality of user terminals for communicating with the computer system (see Bapat et al, column 16, lines 58-61, where “plurality of user terminals” is read on “user workstations 300”.)

As to claims 6 and 7, Bapat et al as modified teaches wherein the control means automatically updates the access management data (see Bapat et al, column 18, lines 36-40) in response to a command that 's automatically issued during the transmitting of the communication (see Bapat et al, column 15, line 67 through column 16, line 7, where

Art Unit: 2175

“transmitting of the communication” is read on “receiving any event notification”, and see column 16, lines 55-61.)

As to claim 8, Bapat et al teaches a communication system (see Abstract, and see column 7, lines 39-41) comprising:

a computer system for controlling access to data to be used in common by multiple users (see Abstract, and see column 32, lines 35-42), comprising:

data storage for storing the data in common (see column 7, lines 37-38, and see column 32, lines 37-40);

an access management table including access management data to control an access right to the data in common (see column 3, lines 31-41, where “access management table” is read on “permission table”); and

control means (see column 3, lines 15-17) for automatically updating the access management data (see column 18, lines 36-40) in the access management table (see column 4, lines 53-54, and see column 8, lines 35-40), concurrent with and in response to transmitting a communication (see column 15, line 67 through column 16, line 7, where “concurrent with” is read on “virtually simultaneously”, and “transmitting communication” is read on “receiving any event notification”, and see column 16, lines 55-61), in which reference information to the data in common are included (see column 8, lines 37-41, where “data in common” is read on “shared with other servers”), wherein the user is granted the access right to the data pursuant to the automatic updating of the access management data responsive to the transmitting of the communication (see column 13, lines 17-30); and

Art Unit: 2175

a plurality of user terminals for communicating with the computer system (see column 16, lines 58-61, where “plurality of user terminals” is read on “user workstations **300**”).

Bapat et al does not teach a first user who is authorized to grant an access right to the data to a second user; and wherein the second user is granted the access rights.

Celik teaches storage and retrieval of business contact information (see Abstract), in which he teaches a first user who is authorized to grant an access right to the data to a second user (see Abstract, and see column 1, lines 50-58, and see column 11, lines 51-57); and wherein the second user is granted the access rights (see Abstract, and see column 2, lines 38-46.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bapat et al to include a first user who is authorized to grant an access right to the data to a second user; and wherein the second user is granted the access rights.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bapat et al by the teachings of Celik, because a first user who is authorized to grant an access right to the data to a second user; and wherein the second user is granted the access rights, would enable select users (master users) to grant access rights and be able to control (modify and/or revoke) such access rights to other users, in order to share contents within a distributed database system.

Art Unit: 2175

As to claim 9, Bapat et al as modified teaches access management table (see Bapat et al, column 3, lines 31-41, where “access management table” is read on “permission table”).

Bapat et al as modified still does not teach wherein the access management table resides on a server external to the first user and the second user.

Celik teaches storage and retrieval of business contact information (see Abstract), in which he teaches wherein the access management table resides on a server external to the first user and the second user (see figure 2B, where “access management table” resides on “Web Database 18”, which is external to “user 1 PC 12” and also external to user 2 PC 14”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bapat et al as modified to include wherein the access management table resides on a server external to the first user and the second user.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bapat et al as modified, with the teaching of Celik, because the access management table residing on a server external to the first user and the second user, would result in the access control/management means to run independently from any users' computer, which would result in a more efficient distributed access control system, in which users can provide access authorization to one another, and in which any user's access could be revoked by the access management system (residing in an external system) without dependencies of the access management system on any one user's computer.

Art Unit: 2175

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 25-March-2003 with respect to claims 1-8 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds for rejection.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tony Mahmoudi whose telephone number is (703) 305-4887. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays from 08:00 am to 04:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at (703) 305-3830.

tm

June 2, 2003


DOV POPOVICI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100